

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 8-14 have been amended. Support for the amendments is provided for example in Fig. 1 and the specification on page 5, lines 2-4.

Claims 8-12 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Rutt (EP 0 447 080) in view of Claus et al. (US 7,133,067). Claim 13 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Rutt in view of Claus and Holder et al. (US 4,637,571). Claim 14 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Rutt in view of Claus and Ahlstrom et al. (US 4,796,834). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse as follows.

Claim 8 now defines a method for forming successive images of a scene captured by a rotating flying body. According to this method, the flying body's rotation is initiated at its launch and several pictures are captured during each revolution of the rotation of the flying body. The captured pictures are geometrically transformed to have the same relative position with respect to the contour of the captured scene. Thereafter, the transformed pictures are displayed. The claimed subject matter supports capturing images of a target with a spinning missile and transforming the captured images for display such that the transformed images display with the same orientation (see specification page 1, line 34, through page 2, line 6).

Moreover, the claimed invention exclusively concerns a rotating body, such as a rotating missile, and the aim of the invention is to avoid a roll-stabilized platform (see specification,

pages 1 and 2). To achieve this aim, an important point of the invention comprises a plurality of particular, well-defined process steps.

Rutt describes an aerial reconnaissance device comprising a conventional mortar ammunition that is fired above a zone to be checked and then slowly descends over the zone suspended by a parachute or balloon. As is well known, a mortar is a gun with a smooth bore (consequently, unable to rotate the ammunition) and mortar ammunitions are equipped with stabilizing winglets for avoiding rotation. Therefore, during its curved trajectory between the mortar and the zone to be checked, the aerial reconnaissance device of Rutt cannot be rotating, but on the contrary is stabilized against spinning. Moreover, during the reconnaissance phase, the aerial reconnaissance device of Rutt is suspended by a parachute or balloon, so that it cannot rotate about its axis. Consequently, at no instant of its use can Rutt's aerial reconnaissance rotate.

Although Rutt discloses that signals from a telemetry package 8 related to the orientation of the reconnaissance device, particularly if it is being deliberately spun, may be used in a command module 15 to produce a steady image of constant orientation (see Rutt page 2 line 56, through page 3, line 4), Rutt does not describe or suggest how "to deliberately spin the reconnaissance device" and how "to produce a steady image," so that these expressions are only wishful thinking. More especially, Rutt does not disclose a rotating missile. With greater reason, Rutt does not describe or suggest the various steps of claim 8.

One can imagine that Rutt may use a stabilized platform as mentioned on pages 1 and 2 of the present application and not the plurality of process steps mentioned in Applicants' claim 8.

In other words, Rutt formulates a general idle proposal without any idea to construct it. Claus is not cited for supplementing the teachings of Rutt in this regard.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Rutt and Claus, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 8. Independent claim 9 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing method claim 8 from the applied references, but with respect to an apparatus.. Therefore, the rejections applied to claims 13 and 14 are obviated, and allowance of claims 8 and 9 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: October 9, 2008
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 073070-6103
Dickinson Wright, PLLC
1901 L Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C.
20036-3506
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559
DC 73070-6103 126534v1